

2712 5362

A

PLAIN STATEMENT
OF
T H E C A S E
RELATING TO
THE INTENDED ESTABLISHMENT
OF
THE PRINCE OF WALES.

[Price One Shilling.]

PLAIN STATEMENT

OF



T. H. B.

THE INTENDED ESTABLISHMENT

OF

THE PRINCE OF WALES.

[Price One Shilling.]

8135. cc
12

A
PLAIN STATEMENT
OF
THE CASE
RELATING TO
THE INTENDED ESTABLISHMENT
OF
THE PRINCE OF WALES,
AND TO
THE MODE PROPOSED TO PARLIAMENT FOR THE
DISCHARGE OF HIS DEBTS OUT OF SUCH
ESTABLISHMENT.

H. George IV., King of Great Britain.

"I shall not be reproached with presumption, when I assert that
"no authority, however respectable, should operate against *matter*
"of fact. I will even go farther, and maintain, that it ceases to be
"respectable the instant it endeavours to evade truth or to promote
"falshood."

LETTER TO THE PRINCE OF WALES.

L O N D O N:

PRINTED FOR T. N. LONGMAN, PATERNOSTER-ROW;
AND J. DEBRETT, PICCADILLY.

1795.

PLAIN PATENT

THE OASIS

RELATING TO

THE PATENTED ESTABLISHMENT



THE TWO PARTS OF THE PATENT FOR THE
IMPROVEMENT OF THE MUSEUM OF THE
BRITISH MUSEUM

THE FIRST PART OF THE PATENT FOR THE
IMPROVEMENT OF THE MUSEUM OF THE
BRITISH MUSEUM

THE SECOND PART OF THE PATENT FOR THE
IMPROVEMENT OF THE MUSEUM OF THE
BRITISH MUSEUM

LONDON

PRINTED BY J. W. BARNES, STATIONER,
AND J. BARNES, PRINTER

ADVERTISEMENT.

TH E recent application to Parliament for an encreased Establishment for the PRINCE OF WALES ~~on~~ the occasion of his Marriage, and for the discharge of his Royal Highness's Debts, together with the proceedings of PARLIAMENT consequent thereon, having been grossly misrepresented ; it is the object of this Publication to strip the question of the meretricious embellishments of Falshood and Sophistry, and to exhibit it to the public eye in the plain but decent garb of Truth and Common Sense.

ADVERTISEMENT.

6 NO 63

A
PLAIN STATEMENT,
&c.

Amicus Plato, sed magis amica Veritas.

THE man who would seek to avert from the Prince any portion of that censure which he has unquestionably deserved for the unwarrantable extravagance which has reduced him to his present embarrassed situation, and appears likely to be productive of consequences more serious than any which can result from the personal inconveniencies to which his Royal Highness may be exposed, could neither be deemed the advocate of Truth nor the Friend of his Country. But *he* who labours to render such extravagance a ground of popular discontent, to enlarge the sphere of its influence beyond its actual limits, to extend the censure it extorts to those to whom it cannot possibly attach, and to misrepresent the

the

the circumstances to which it has given rise, and the regulations which it is about to produce, has not merely less powerful claims to public approbation, on the score either of veracity or of patriotism, but, in fact, deserves the severest reprobation.

IN a popular Pamphlet; in which some feeble rays of truth are descried faintly beaming through a thick cloud of calumny, and a small portion of well-founded censure appears amidst a surrounding mass of acrimonious invective, it is positively asserted, that by the Message from the King to the House of Commons in May 1787, his Majesty solemnly pledged *himself*, that the Prince would never contract any debts in future; that no future application should ever be made to Parliament for the payment of His Royal Highness's debts by the Nation; and that the late Message to Parliament from the Throne is an application for the payment of debts (by the Nation) contracted since that time; by which **THE KING** has been guilty of a breach of promise, of a violation of his royal word *.

* See pages 1. 7. 14. of "A Letter to the Prince of Wales."

THE man who, without hesitation, prefers against his Sovereign a charge of falshood, should, *at least*, be careful not to subject himself to a similar imputation, but unequivocally to evince his rooted abhorrence of the vice he so loudly condemns, by the most rigid adherence to truth. In answer to the assertions I have noticed, I aver, that the King did *not*, by his Message to the House in May 1787, pledge *himself*, in the smallest degree, that the Prince should contract no farther debts, and that no future application should be made to Parliament for the discharge of his debts; that the late Message to Parliament from the Throne was *not* an application for the payment of the Prince's debts by the Nation; and that the King has *not* been guilty of a breach of promise, nor of a violation of his word. On this point, therefore, I am completely at issue with the Author of the Pamphlet, and the Public must decide to which of us the charge of falshood ought to be affixed.

IN order to set this matter in a fair point of view, it will suffice to state, as briefly as

B

may

may be, the leading circumstances of the transaction upon which the question arises.

ON the twenty-first of May 1787, a Message from the King was delivered to the House of Commons, the object of which was, to request the assistance of Parliament in the discharge of a debt contracted by the Prince to the amount of 193,648l.—The only parts of that Message which relate to the future conduct of the Prince are the following :

“ His Majesty could not, however, expect
 “ or desire the assistance of this House but on
 “ a well-grounded *expectation*, that the Prince
 “ will avoid contracting any debts in future.

——“ and his Majesty has the satisfaction
 “ to *inform* the House, that THE PRINCE OF
 “ WALES *has given* HIS MAJESTY the fullest
 “ assurance of his determination to confine
 “ his future expences within his income, and
 “ has also settled a plan for arranging those
 “ expences in the several departments, and
 “ for fixing an order for payment under such
 “ regulations as his Majesty *trusts* will effectually

“tually secure the due execution of the
“Prince’s intentions *.”

Do these passages exhibit anything like a *promise*? Do they contain anything which even the subtle ingenuity of inventive malice can construe into a *pledge*, on the part of *his Majesty*, that the Prince should in future contract no debts, and make no future application to Parliament? Is there any one expression that can, even by the most forced construction, be made to bear such an interpretation? The King merely informed the House, that he had good reason to *expect* that the Prince would contract no farther debts, and that he had received from his son the strongest assurances of future economy. Indeed, it is absurd to suppose, that his Majesty would pledge himself for the prudence of that conduct over which he had no kind of control. The Prince, however, was certainly bound to abide by the assurances he had given, since

* I have taken the words of the Message from “Woodfall’s Parliamentary Reports;” and as Mr. Woodfall’s accuracy, as a Reporter, has never yet been questioned, I have every reason to believe they are correctly stated.

we have been told, from authority, that the Message was read to his Royal Highness before it was delivered to the House ; of course it had his concurrence, and, as far as relates to the assurances it contained, the Message may be considered as his own. For any breach of promise, therefore, or, to speak more correctly, for any failure to abide by the determination he had formed, the Prince alone is responsible ; the King cannot, possibly, be implicated in the guilt, nor, consequently, exposed to the censure it incurs. His Majesty, on the contrary, is entitled to approbation for his voluntary efforts to prevent such failure, by an addition of Ten Thousand Pounds to the annual income of his son, which he caused to be paid out of the Civil List.

PARLIAMENT having voted an adequate sum for the discharge of the debt, and acceded to the propriety of granting an increased income, nothing farther was heard from the Throne, on the subject of the Heir-Apparent, until the twenty-seventh of April, when Mr. Pitt delivered a Message from the King to the House of Commons. The profusion of
which

which the Prince was guilty in the interval of eight years which occurred between the delivery of the two Messages, when it did not tend to the support of that splendor and dignity which it became him to display, but was rendered conducive to gratifications unworthy of his rank and station, is indisputably obnoxious to censure ; and, whether we consider the pernicious tendency of the *example*, or the breach of promise implied, or violation of assurances given in the Message of 1787, it will, probably, by most, be regarded as sufficient to justify the poignant language of reproof. But censure, however deserved, must surely have bounds ; and even to reproof does justice prescribe limitations. Though reduced, by extreme imprudence, to extreme embarrassments, the Prince never harboured the preposterous idea of loading the Nation with his Debts ; but concurred in the opinion of his Royal Father, that as the error had been his, his should be the inconvenience that must result from the application of the remedy.

THE necessity of a radical reform in the application of the Prince's revenue, which
could

could only be effected by a total change in his mode of life, having been demonstrated and acknowledged, the first step towards the accomplishment of this desirable object was his separation from one who had certainly contributed, in no small degree, to swell the list of his Debts—who, in direct contradiction to the conscientious opinion of Divines of her own persuasion, had assumed a character unfashioned by Religion, and disavowed by Law—and who still continues to insult the Public by a display of parade unsuitable to her situation, and by the exhibition of certain characteristic decorations appropriate only to that sphere in which she was never destined to move,

In farther pursuance of this laudable system of reform, his Royal Highness listened to the prudent suggestions of his *real* friends, and contracted a marriage sanctioned by the approbation of his family and the applause of the Nation. With honest effusions of unfeigned zeal, the people loudly welcomed the lovely stranger to their hospitable shores; and the public voice at once proclaimed her
the

the fair harbinger of domestic peace, and hailed her as the certain pledge of lasting reformation.

THE necessary consequence of this marriage was an application to Parliament from the Throne for an increased Establishment, that might enable the Prince to bear the unavoidable expence of his new situation—an application which has invariably been made on all similar occasions, and which has never incurred the smallest blame, nor experienced the smallest resistance.

BUT the Message delivered to the House of Commons on the twenty-seventh of April has been represented, by the Author of “The Letter to the Prince,” as differing from all former Messages—as being, in fact, a *second* call upon the People for the discharge of the Prince’s engagements *—a solicitation to Parliament for “an enormous sum amounting to *near a million, to discharge debts wantonly contracted* †.” How far the fact is as this Writer represents it to be, I shall now

* Page 4.

† Page 5.

proceed to shew from the Message itself, which begins thus :

“ His Majesty relies on the liberality and
 “ affection of his faithful Commons, and on
 “ the cordial interest which they have mani-
 “ fested in the happy event of the nuptials
 “ of the Prince and Princess of Wales, that
 “ they will be ready to concur in such provi-
 “ sion as they may judge necessary to enable
 “ his Majesty *to settle an establishment for the*
 “ *Prince and Princess* suited to their rank and
 “ dignity.”

THUS far, I apprehend, it will scarcely be contended, that this Message differs from any former Message presented on a similar occasion. It merely solicits for the illustrious pair such an Establishment as Parliament may think necessary. Had the Message proceeded no farther, the Writer of the Letter would not have had even a *pretext* for the groundless assertion that the Prince had called a second time on the People to pay his debts. But the reader doubtless expects to find, in the subsequent parts of this Message, an applica-
 tion

tion for a *farther* sum of “ near a million,” in *addition* to the provision for the Establishment, that will justify the assertion I have ventured to stigmatize as groundless. Let the Message speak for itself.

“ ON an occasion in all other respects so
“ satisfactory, his Majesty feels the deepest
“ regret in being under the necessity of com-
“ municating to the House, that the benefit
“ of any settlement to be now made cannot be
“ effectually secured to the Prince of Wales,
“ without providing the means of freeing him
“ from incumbrances to a large amount, to
“ which he is now subject.”

WE shall now see what mode the King wished to be adopted for the removal of these incumbrances, and whether or not he asked for a sum amounting to “ near a million,” or even for a *single farthing*.

“ ANXIOUS as his Majesty must necessarily
“ be, particularly under the present circum-
“ stances, to relieve the Prince of Wales from
C “ these

“ these difficulties, HIS MAJESTY ENTER-
 “ TAINS NO IDEA OF PROPOSING TO HIS
 “ PARLIAMENT TO MAKE ANY PROVISION
 “ FOR THIS OBJECT, OTHERWISE THAN BY
 “ THE APPLICATION OF A PART OF THE
 “ INCOME WHICH MAY BE SETTLED ON
 “ THE PRINCE ; but he earnestly recom-
 “ mends it to the House to consider of the
 “ propriety of *thus* providing for the gradual
 “ discharge of these incumbrances, by appro-
 “ priating and securing, for a given term, the
 “ revenues arising from the Duchy of Corn-
 “ wall, together with a proportion of the
 “ Prince’s other annual income.”—What
 words can be more plain and unequivocal,
 less open to misconstruction, less liable to
 mistake ? How any man, with this Message
 before his eyes, can have the confidence to
 assert, that it contains either a breach of any
 promise or pledge given, or even *supposed* to
 be given, by his Majesty, in the Message of
 1787, or a second call on the People by the
 Prince to pay his debts, is to me, I confess,
 inconceivable. It is really wonderful, that
 the Author of the Pamphlet should not have
 been aware, that, by accusing his Sovereign on
 such

such grounds as these, of having violated his word, he subjected *himself* to the charge of having advanced *a palpable and deliberate falsehood*, as well as to that of a gross violation of decency—of a shocking breach of his duty and allegiance.

It is evident from the Message, that no application has been made to Parliament, on behalf of the Prince of Wales, for one single farthing towards the payment of his debts ; that those debts are to be paid entirely out of his annual income ; and that consequently he alone will experience, as in justice he ought, the evil effects of his own imprudence in having contracted them.

THE only point for consideration appears to have been, the *quantum* of the allowance to be granted to his Royal Highness ; and whether the sum of One Hundred and Twenty-Five Thousand Pounds, exclusive of the revenue of the Duchy of Cornwall, as proposed by Mr. Pitt, was to be regarded as too ample an income. A very considerable majority in the House of Commons have de-

cided, that it is not too ample ; and, in my opinion, they have decided wisely and justly. One Hundred Thousand Pounds was the income allotted to his Grandfather ; and when we consider the great rise which has taken place in the price of every article of general consumption within the last forty years, to say nothing of the increased expence arising from the difference in the mode and habits of fashionable life, (which ought, however, for obvious reasons, to be included in the calculation) the addition of Twenty-Five Thousand Pounds must certainly appear to be rather an inadequate than an exorbitant increase.—If a due proportion had been observed, the increase must have been much more considerable. Some Members, indeed, mentioned the present state of the kingdom as an objection to the proposed augmentation ; but those Gentlemen seem to have forgotten, that if our expenditure be increased, so are our resources, beyond all example ; and that the kingdom, all circumstances considered, is in a much more flourishing state than it was in at the period when the income of the late Prince of Wales was established. I mean to say, that the Nation

is

is now better able to allow One Hundred and Twenty-Five Thousand Pounds a-year to the Heir-Apparent than it was to allot One Hundred Thousand Pounds for the same purpose forty years ago. The necessity of supporting the dignity of the Heir-Apparent it is needless to enforce; every Englishman must know, that his Royal Highness forms an essential, nay a *vital*, part of that Constitution which it is both the duty and the interest of every individual to maintain.

HAVING thus faithfully stated the real object of the King's Message, let me now ask, If all those parts had been omitted which relate to the regulations suggested for the discharge of the Debts, whether a question would have arisen on the subject, or a murmur of discontent have been heard? I think I am warranted in asserting, that the Bill for the Establishment would have passed with unanimity, and the Public have never been addressed upon the point. Admitting this to have been the case, and supposing the Prince were, under these circumstances, to apply to Parliament, during the next Session, requesting their assistance

sistance in appropriating a part of his income, *already granted*, to the payment of his Debts; what sensation would such a step excite in the minds of Parliament, and of the Public? Would it not incur universal approbation, and command universal applause? Certain I am, that the attention it would display to the claims of justice ought to produce such an effect.—Let me then ask, What constitutes the difference in respect of the Public, between that mode of proceeding, and the mode adopted in the present instance? I defy the most ingenious sophister to make it appear that *that* should command approbation, and *this* censure. The House of Commons voted the Establishment in the first instance; and then proceeded to regulate the plan for the discharge of the Debts *out of* such Establishment. Whether an interval of a day or an interval of a year were suffered to elapse between the adoption of the first, and the consideration of the last measure, it could make no possible difference in the nature of the transaction; its effect must be precisely the same.

BUT the last Message is stated, in the Publication to which I have so frequently adverted, to be unlike the first, inasmuch “as it
 “ was not accompanied by any assurance,
 “ either from the King or His Royal High-
 “ nefs, that no future demand of the kind
 “ (that is, for the payment of debts) should
 “ be repeated ;”—and we are told, “that this
 “ warrants a belief, that the parties consider
 “ themselves entitled to call on the *extra*
 “ bounty of the Nation whenever they think
 “ proper, or that the assurance was not given
 “ because its veracity could not be relied on*.”

The insinuation is as false and indecent as the inference is unwarrantable. Any person, who had attended to the construction of this passage, without reading the Message, would naturally be led to conclude, that the latter contained not a syllable on the subject of future economy. Let me once more oppose fact to misrepresentation—the Message to the Letter. The Message concludes thus : “And his
 “ Majesty will be ready and desirous to con-
 “ cur in any provisions which the wisdom of

* Page 40.

“ Parliament may suggest for the purpose
 “ of establishing a regular and punctual order
 “ of payment in the Prince’s future expen-
 “ diture, and of guarding against the possibi-
 “ lity of the Prince being again involved in so
 “ painful and embarrassing a situation.”

I SHOULD be glad to learn from this *modest* Author, whether he will deny that the proposal of regulations calculated to prevent the possibility of incurring debts in future, is the best assurance and the best pledge that can be given that no such Debts shall be incurred ? I believe there is no honest man in the kingdom that will for a moment maintain, that, after such a proposal, to hold the weaker language of assurance would be the height of absurdity. The assertion, that the Message of 1795 is *unlike* the Message of 1787, is as correct as the inference drawn from it is false ; the latter was an *extraordinary* application to Parliament for the payment of Debts—the former was a *customary* application, invariably made on the marriage of the Heir-Apparent, for a suitable provision.

FROM

FROM this brief statement of facts it appears, that the people are not called upon to contribute a single farthing to the payment of the Prince's Debts; that those Debts are to be entirely discharged out of the provision made for His Royal Highness by Parliament; and that such provision is not greater than it would have been if the Prince had not incurred any Debts*.

THE only exception that can possibly occur to the general conclusion I have drawn, is this—That in the event of the Prince's death before his Debts shall be discharged, and previous to his succession to the Throne, the Nation will be burdened with such a part of his Debts as shall then remain unpaid. But

* I am aware it may be urged, that two or three Members declared they had voted for the allowance of 125,000*l.* in contemplation of the incumbrances to which the Prince was subject; but it is evident that the majority were influenced by no such consideration; for a doubt having been once suggested on this subject, they would not have failed to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded them, when the question was put in the Committee, of declaring that they voted for the largest sum proposed, with a view to the Debts.

D

this

this contingent risk is so trifling as scarcely to be worthy of notice ; besides, I conceive, even that might be avoided, if it were deemed expedient to insure the Prince's life against the King's, and to appropriate a farther part of the income of the former to that purpose. Had, indeed, that due proportion, which I before mentioned, been observed, and the allowance of the Prince been made *equal* to that which Parliament granted to his Grandfather, this object might have been secured without any farther diminution of his Royal Highness's income.

HAVING exposed many gross misrepresentations contained in the " Letter to the Prince of Wales," I would willingly investigate the motives which induced the Author to publish a Pamphlet so well calculated to excite a spirit of discontent. But though precluded, by the very nature of the case, from entering upon such an investigation, some few observations upon different passages may, perhaps, tend to throw a light upon the subject, and at least give birth to probable conjectures. I make no scruple to say, that if his

his motives had been pure and upright, he would, when preferring a most serious charge against his Sovereign and the Heir-Apparent to the Throne, have displayed, in his exhibition of facts, a most rigid adherence to truth ; he would have preserved that perfect consistency which prevents a possibility of contradiction between actions and professions ; he would not have said, “ I have not the least
 “ objection that the scandalous histories at-
 “ tached to Newmarket, and all the little
 “ contrivances to abuse the credulous sim-
 “ plicity of the Nation, should be buried in
 “ oblivion”—and yet revive the very calum-
 ny to which he alluded, by the republication of a Letter in which it was advanced and propagated * ;—he would not have been guilty of equivocation in stating the amount of the Prince’s Debts, representing them at one

* It is almost needless to observe, that I consider the pretended “ Publisher” as a fictitious personage ; nor do I believe so shallow an artifice can make a dupe of any man. The observations in the Postscript on the “ Letters of Neptune and Legion,” convince me that they were written by the Author of the “ Letter to the Prince of Wales.”

time as amounting to “near a million *,” at another, rating them at seven hundred thousand pounds, and *insinuating* that they amount to double that sum † ;—he would not have stated the only point for consideration, upon which he would *descend* to join issue ‡, to be, whether the Prince ought to have confined himself within his income, a point upon which no difference of opinion could arise, and yet have adverted to various other points, and thereby subjected himself to positive contradiction ;—he would not have placed all the faults of the Prince in a prominent point of view, and have studiously kept his virtues out of sight ;—and he would not, while employed

* Page 5.

† Pages 8. 50. Both these statements are erroneous ; the Debts, according to the account delivered to the House of Commons, the accuracy of which there can be little reason to suspect, amount only to 639,890l. 4s. 4d. The separate sums voted towards defraying the expences of the marriage, and completing Carlton-House, cannot be taken into the account ; since it has always been customary, on the marriage of a Prince, to assign him a certain sum, independent of his establishment, for defraying contingent expences ; and Carlton-House is a public building.

‡ Pages 40, 41.

in

in enforcing the wholesome precepts of virtue, and the salutary admonitions of prudence, have neglected to adduce the very apposite example of the Royal Parents of His Highness, “ whose conduct and unblemished
 “ morals have essentially contributed to pre-
 “ serve from pollution the morals of the
 “ Capital *.”

* These are the words of a very respectable Member of the House of Commons, the excellence of whose character effectually exempts him from all suspicion of flattery or misrepresentation.—He expressed the most solemn gratitude to our truly virtuous Sovereign, and, with great truth, declared, that so long as their example was followed, the kingdom would reap infinite advantage.

(See Mr. Wilberforce's *Speech of the 15th of May.*)

I cannot omit the following just remark on the same subject of a modern Writer, equally distinguished for the excellence of his character, and the solidity of his talents:—

“ While the Throne exhibits so excellent a pattern
 “ of all the virtues which can ornament humanity and
 “ benefit mankind, how should the influence of the
 “ bright and useful example be communicated, from
 “ rank to rank, till it pervade the utmost recesses of
 “ society ! Then, indeed, would civil liberty be invi-
 “ gorated and adorned by private virtue and domestic
 “ happiness.”

IF he had been actuated by those motives which ought to influence the mind of every true Briton, he would not have endeavoured to raise an unconstitutional distinction between the different Branches of the Legislature, by representing the House of Commons as the *most* valuable and *most* important Branch *, when every true friend to the Constitution must consider them all as *equally* valuable, and *equally* important, because equally essential to the support of that Constitution. He would not have stated the great object of the War to be the preservation of the Prince and his family from ruin †, when he must know that the War has for its object, the preservation not only of our political Independence, but of our Laws, our Religion, our Constitution, our National Rights as Britons, our social

* Page 2. Does not this resemble the language of a French Jacobin in the year 1789, rather than that of an English Royalist in the year 1795? It was the unconstitutional superiority given to the *Tiers Etat*, or Commons, by the enemies to the State, at the commencement of the Revolution (a doctrine, be it observed, which was first broached in *Pamphlets*), that overthrew the Monarchy of France.

* Page 5.

comforts

comforts as Men *. He would not have represented the Nation as being “ most *oppressively* and *shamefully* burthened † ;” because oppression, in this sense, implies an *unjust* exertion of power, and is wholly inapplicable to the proceedings of a British Legislature ; and because no burthens can be deemed shameful which are imposed by the Representatives of a Free People, and by that People cheerfully supported, for the purposes of self-preservation and defence. He would not have applied the term “ very onerous” to the establishment of Monarchy ‡, because it conveys a false idea to uninformed minds, as Monarchy has the advantage of being not only the *best*, but ultimately the *cheapest* establishment §. He would not have asserted that

* In the preservation of these, the preservation of the Prince and his family, in common with that of every other Briton, is most certainly involved ; but *their* preservation forms no separate and distinct object of the War, as the words of the Pamphlet imply.

† Page 9.

‡ Page 10.

§ The infant state of America may, perhaps, be cited as an example to invalidate my observation : but, I apprehend,

that the laborious poor have been compelled to become insurgents for the preservation of their lives *, when he knew that the legal rates and voluntary contributions were fully adequate to their support ; that English Charity shone eminently conspicuous in the annals of human benevolence ; that the dearth of provisions was not owing to any circumstance which the Government of the country could prevent, but to natural causes, the effects of which should be patiently endured, as proceeding from the dispensations of Providence ; and that the desperate and unwarrantable resource of insurrection, must necessarily encrease the very evil it was intended to remove. - He would not have so far deviated from the characteristic humanity of an English mind, as to insult the unfortunate in

apprehend, it is not a case in point, as the *peculiar* circumstances attending it, render it, in my opinion, an *exception* to a rule.—In the Republic of France, the mere wages of the Deputies of the Convention cost the people near *half a million sterling* a-year. Reckoning 800 Deputies at a daily stipend of one guinea and a half, the exact annual amount of their wages would be 459,900*l.*

* Pages 12, 13.

the hour of calamity; by exaggerating the past errors of Princes inured, from their infancy, to habits of dissipation; and by calumniating "the better part of mankind *," in ascribing to them an approbation of the scandalous injustice and abominable persecutions which those Princes have experienced. And he would not, by asserting that "the Court of Versailles was *deservedly* annihilated †," have given an indirect kind of sanction to the Revolution itself, as well as to the foul and atrocious murder of that Monarch who was at the head of the Court, and whose ruin was the necessary consequence of its annihilation—a Monarch, whose merits were infinitely superior to any commendations which my pen can bestow; who amidst the most fascinating allurements observed the most rigid forbearance; and who, in the midst of temptations the best calculated to seduce from their duty

* Page 4.

† Page 2. It is not less false than preposterous to assert, that any extravagancies of which the Princes of the Blood Royal in France *could* be guilty, could occasion the Revolution. The man who betrays such gross ignorance of the *true* cause of the French Revolution, would do well to be silent on that subject.

men of exalted rank, displayed virtues, which, however they may be under-rated in the present day, cannot fail to endear him to posterity.

To comment, in a proper manner, on the various passages to which I have here referred, would require a discussion of much greater length than would be consistent with the plan and object of this publication. These references, however, will be sufficient to warrant the conclusions I have drawn, and to afford me a complete justification for withholding my belief from the sincerity of those professions of the Author which are intended to prove his loyalty to the Sovereign, and his attachment to the Constitution. Though I have acknowledged the truth and justice of some of his observations, yet, in my apprehension, the merit of these is so much overbalanced by the pernicious tendency of others, that I should be less surprized to find that the whole was the production of a *ci-devant* Member of the Jacobin Club, than that it

proceeded from the pen of a Friend to the British Government.—By the omission to prefix his name to the Letter, the Author has certainly with-holden from the Public the most certain criterion by which they might judge of his sincerity ; and, in my mind, I confess, the mere *ipse dixit* of an Anonymous Writer is inadequate to repel the conviction produced by the force of internal evidence.—But on this, as on all other points to which I have here adverted, the Public, to whom, with full confidence and due respect, I appeal, must finally decide.

T H E E N D.